

## Multiple Park Playground Rehabilitation (Homeridge, Bowers, Machado Parks) RFP Questions & Answers

1. *What is the City's soft costs percentage for the project/scope listed in the RFP?*  
8%, or \$67,734.
2. *Do the soft costs come out of the \$195K (listed as the outreach/design budget)?*  
No, the soft costs will come out of the overall CIP Project #3178 budget.
3. *Is the \$575,000 for the rehabilitation/construction budget the total amount available for all three parks? Does it include construction contingency?*  
Yes, the total construction budget for three park playgrounds and any other amenities, contingencies, etc., is \$575,000.
4. *Will the City Council allocate additional funding, if needed?*  
As stated in the Pre-Proposal Meeting held at Homeridge Park on May 11, 2017, the public input process (conducted by the selected firm and City, using the on-line "Open City Hall Survey", and community place making meetings) and the Facility Condition Assessment (conducted separately by Kitchell/CEM) will assist in identifying and prioritizing each of the three (3) parks' issues, top neighborhood park concerns, potential desirable, but unfunded, park elements beyond the scope of the playground and BBQ area(s). While the priority and focus is playground rehabilitation, all of the items raised should be included in the conceptual and schematic design options and cost estimate(s) to be presented as a prioritized/phased work plan to be considered by the Parks & Recreation Commission for potential recommendation to the City Council. Any additional funding for approved park elements or rehabilitation is subject to Council approval and budget appropriation; therefore, it is not guaranteed.
5. *When will Kitchell's Facility Condition Assessment Report be available?*  
November 2017.
6. *Will Kitchell's Facility Condition Assessment Report provide information regarding: accessibility, trees, utilities, restroom, irrigation, and biotics (creek).*  
It will provide an inventory of assets, their condition, and valuation. See City Parks Projects page and Kitchell agreement for more information.
7. *The RFP states repeatedly that "Master Planning" the park is part of the outreach scope. Will our proposal for construction documents address the plans necessary to construct the improvements within the \$575,000 budget only, or will the consultant team be required to provide plans and documents for multiple phases, beyond the \$575,000 construction budget, as a response to the Master Plan?*  
See question 4 above. The conceptual and schematic plans are necessary for the overall park, and construction level documentation expected for the proposed/approved

improvements such as playgrounds, pathways, bbq area(s). Restroom or building improvements if recommended by the community and Commission, and approved by Council, would be under a separate scope, construction plans and specifications, and funding. Homeridge Park may need more “master planning” than Machado Park and Bowers Park.

8. *Is there currently a study completed for the connection trail reach, which passes by the project identified in the RFP? If a study has been performed, can it be made available prior to the RFP due date?*

The Creek Trail, while it connects to Homeridge Park and Bowers Park, is not part of this project scope. Creek trail projects in Santa Clara are under the direction of the Public Works Department. Any relevant information will be separately provided to the successful bidder.

9. *Are there known storm water requirements for the anticipated scope of construction?*  
TBD.

10. *Does the City have any specific positive or negative experience with water play features in play areas? Specifically, we are referring not to major elements of ‘splash pad’ or ‘dry fountain’ features, but rather to a small faucet or similar feature that would allow for play with sand.*

No. See answer to question 4.

11. *We heard specific deficiencies noted by the City: ADA compliance, CPSC compliance, play features available based upon research on play value and elements of play. Are there already known specific deficiencies noted by site users?*

Dog litter dispenser, pathways, 1/2 basketball court, restroom, non-native tree hazards and locations (eucalyptus, under utility lines), creek habitat preservation. See answer to question 4.

12. *Which firms can submit proposals?*

Any and all qualified firms are welcome to bid; full firm profiles and qualifications are required in response to the RFP.

13. *How essential is the topo survey; does one exist?*

While “as built” paper drawings exist, the parks have not been surveyed.

### Helpful Links

- Place Making - [http://www.pps.org/reference/what\\_is\\_placemaking/](http://www.pps.org/reference/what_is_placemaking/)
- Play Value - <http://www.playcore.com/play-value.html>
- Outdoor Fitness - <http://www.athleticbusiness.com/outdoor/what-to-consider-when-adding-outdoor-fitness-to-a-park.html>
- Age Friendly Cities <http://www.agefriendlysiliconvalley.org/>

- Age Friendly Parks [http://www.pcaagefriendly.org/Files/age-friendly\\_Checklist-June\\_2011.pdf](http://www.pcaagefriendly.org/Files/age-friendly_Checklist-June_2011.pdf)
- Sustainable Parks <http://meetingoftheminds.org/sustainable-parks-work-10514>
- City Developmental Review Process  
<http://santaclaraca.gov/government/departments/community-development/planning-division/development-review>
- California Park & Recreation Park Finder - [https://www.parks.ca.gov/?page\\_id=26166](https://www.parks.ca.gov/?page_id=26166)